

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0073759 to Koga et al (“Koga”). The Examiner has rejected claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,440,203 to Kato (“Kato”). The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0024086 to Segawa et al (“Segawa”). Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0020730 to Valentini et al (“Valentini”). Claims 3 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 7 are currently amended. As a result, claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 10-12 are currently pending. The following remarks are considered by applicant to overcome each of the Examiner's outstanding rejections to current claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 10-12. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore requested.

I. SUMMARY OF RELEVANT LAW

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, AND 4-6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(E) BASED ON KOGA

In paragraph 3 of the current Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Koga. This rejection is respectfully traversed and believed overcome in view of the following discussion.

With respect to this rejection, Examiner contends Koga discloses an ink-jet ink comprising water, pigment such as carbon black, 0.01-20% acrylic polymer, and 2-15% glycol ethers including dipropylene glycol n-propyl ether and tripropylene glycol n-butyl ether. 7/13/05 Office Action, P. 3, ¶ 5 (citing Koga, paragraphs 1, 4, 13-15, 20-21, 24, 26, 28 [line 8], 30, 33, 42 [line 6], 43 [line 6], and 50).

A. CLAIM 1

Amended Claim 1 states that “a blending ratio of the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer is 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight.”

The acrylic polymer has a first property in which it is adsorbed to the coloring agent, and also a second property in which it is localized in the vicinity of the gas-liquid interfaces and solid-liquid interfaces in the ink. If there is not any compound affecting the acrylic polymer in the ink, the first and the second properties of the acrylic polymer are well balanced (equilibrium) depending on the strength of one of the properties.

That is, in ordinary cases, an excessive amount of the acrylic polymer, which is not adsorbed to the coloring agent, has been localized by the surface activity in the vicinity of the surfaces of the ink droplets (gas-liquid interfaces and solid-liquid interfaces) in the ink for ink-jet recording containing the acrylic polymer. Application (as published), ¶ [0015]. Therefore, when the ink droplets are adhered to portions disposed around the nozzle of the recording head, and the water is evaporated, then the concentration of the acrylic polymer is extremely increased in the vicinity of the surfaces of the ink droplets to form sticky or cohesive residues having high viscosities which behave as the obstacle to inhibit the straight travel stability of the ink droplets during the discharge of the ink from the nozzle. *Id.*

When the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether and/or the dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether is contained in the ink for ink-jet recording containing the acrylic polymer, the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether and/or the dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether exists in the vicinity of the surfaces of the ink droplets in place of the acrylic polymer, because the ethers have a stronger surface-activating function as compared with the acrylic polymer. *Id.* As a result, the localization of the acrylic polymer is avoided on the ink droplet surfaces, and most of acrylic polymer tends to be adsorbed to the coloring agent. *Id.* In order to cause such adsorption of the acrylic polymer to the coloring agent, a particular amount of the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether and/or dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer is needed.

At one end, it has been found that a minimum of 0.5 of the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether and/or dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer is needed. See Application (as published), ¶ [0016] and Examples. At the other end, if the blending ratio exceeds a maximum of 2, the phenomenon of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether and/or dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether localization in the vicinity of the gas-liquid interfaces has been saturated and the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether or

dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether also affects the adsorption of acrylic polymer to the coloring agent. Accordingly, the acrylic polymer, that was once adsorbed to the coloring agent and is now free, might replace some of the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether or dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether that exists in the vicinity of the surfaces of the ink droplets. Therefore, it is desired that the blending ratio is not more than 2. See Application (as published) ¶ [0016] and Examples. Thus, the blending ratio 0.5 to 2 of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether or dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer is important for the effect of the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether or dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether.

With respect to this claim, Examiner contends that, since Koga discloses the glycol ether can be 15% and the acrylic polymer can be 20%, Koga discloses that the ratio of glycol ether to acrylic polymer can be 0.75. 7/13/05 Office Action, P. 3, ¶ 5. Examiner, in effect, argues that while not all inks with the disclosed amounts of glycol ether and acrylic polymer in Koga fall within the claimed ratio range of 0.5-2 of the current application, some combinations do fall within that range. However, Koga never discloses any specific examples falling within the claimed range. In addition, the range disclosed in Koga is 0.1 to 1500 (2/20 to 15/.01).

The MPEP provides instruction for situations like this:

When the prior art discloses a range which touches, overlaps or is within the claimed range, but no specific examples falling within the claimed range are disclosed, a case by case determination must be made as to anticipation. ... If the claims are directed to a narrow range, the reference teaches a broad range, and there is evidence of **unexpected results** within the claimed narrow range ... it may be reasonable to conclude that the narrow range is not disclosed with "sufficient specificity" to constitute an anticipation of the claims. The unexpected results may also render the claims unobvious. The question of "sufficient specificity" is similar to that of "clearly envisaging" a species from a generic teaching. See MPEP § 2131.02. A 35 U.S.C. 102/103 combination rejection is permitted if it is unclear if the reference teaches the range with "sufficient specificity." **The examiner must, in this case, provide reasons for anticipation as well as a motivational statement regarding obviousness.**

MPEP § 2131.03[II] (emphasis added).

1. Unexpected Results

The unexpected result in this case is that, when an acrylic polymer is used in an ink, the requirements for straight travel stability of ink droplets during the discharge, recovery performance upon introduction into the recording head, fixation performance of printed matters, and drying performance after printing can be met by adjusting the blending ratio of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer to be in the range of 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight.

The inventors of the present application discovered, among numerous combinations, that the combination of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether and the acrylic polymer, in the specified proportional range of Claim 1, is excellent in straight travel stability, recovery performance, fixation performance, and drying performance as indicated in Table 12 of the present application.

Before Applicants' discoveries, adding an acrylic polymer to improve the recovery performance upon introduction into the recording head and improve the fixation performance, resulted in unstable discharge from the recording head and deteriorated straight travel stability of ink droplets. Application (as published), P. 1, ¶¶ [0007]-[0008]. It was unexpected that adding tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether, such that the blending ratio of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer is 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight, would stabilize discharge from the recording head and improve straight travel stability while maintaining the improved fixation performance. Because of this unexpected result, Applicants respectfully assert that the narrow claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 2 is not disclosed by Koga with "sufficient specificity" to constitute an anticipation of the claims.

2. No Reason for Anticipation or Motivation for Obviousness

Koga provides neither reason for anticipation nor any motivation regarding obviousness. First, Koga never discloses any effect on straight travel stability or recording head discharge stability by adding tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer. As such there is no reason for anticipation of the unexpected results of the current application that modifying the proportion of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether to the acrylic polymer, such that their blending ratio is 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight, improves the straight travel stability while maintaining the improved recovery performance and fixation performance obtained by the addition of the acrylic polymer.

Second, Koga teaches solving the problem of color bleed by using a polyoxyalkylene glycol-n-alkyl ether. Koga, P. 3, ¶ [0044]. Specifically, Koga teaches that it is the combination of (1) a poly propylene glycol-n-butyl ether having three or more propylene oxides with (2) an acetylene glycol/ethylene oxide adduct and (3) another polyoxyalkylene glycol-n-alkyl ether that alleviates bleeding. Koga, P. 3, ¶ [0045].

Never does Koga discuss any interaction between tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether and an acrylic polymer. In fact, the acrylic polymer in Koga is disclosed as a dispersant rather than for use to improve recovery performance and fixation performance.

Since Koga never discusses any of the problems addressed by the current application and uses the acrylic polymer only as a dispersant, it provides no motivation to solve the problems addressed in the current application. As such, Koga does not render the narrowly claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 2 obvious.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 is not disclosed with “sufficient specificity” by Koga to constitute anticipation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0073759 to Koga et al.

B. CLAIM 2

Claim 2 is dependant upon Claim 1. As Claim 1 is allowable, so must be Claim 2. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0073759 to Koga et al.

C. CLAIM 4

Claim 4 states that “a content of the tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether is 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to a total amount of the ink.”

With respect to this claim, Examiner contends that, since Koga discloses the glycol ether can be in the range of 2-15% it anticipates the claimed range. 7/13/05 Office Action, P. 3, ¶ 5. However, Koga never discloses any specific examples falling within the claimed range. In addition, the range disclosed in Koga both overlaps and is larger than the narrowly claimed range in the current application.

As with Claim 1 above, the MPEP provides instruction for situations like this. MPEP § 2131.03[II].

1. Unexpected Results

The unexpected result in this case is that, when an acrylic polymer is used in an ink, the requirements for straight travel stability of ink droplets during the discharge, recovery performance upon introduction into the recording head, fixation performance of printed matters, and drying performance after printing can be met by the addition of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether in the range of 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to a total amount of the ink.

The inventors of the present application discovered, among numerous combinations, that the combination of the acrylic polymer and tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether, in the specified range of Claim 4, is excellent in straight travel stability, recovery performance, fixation performance, and drying performance as indicated in Table 12 of the present application.

Before Applicants' discoveries, adding an acrylic polymer to improve the recovery performance upon introduction into the recording head and improve the fixation performance, resulted in unstable discharge from the recording head and deteriorated straight travel stability of ink droplets. Application (as published), P. 1, ¶¶ [0007]-[0008]. It was unexpected that adding tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether, such that the content of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether is 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to the total amount of the ink, would stabilize discharge from the recording head and improve straight travel stability while maintaining the improved fixation performance. Because of this unexpected result, Applicants respectfully assert that the narrow claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 5% is not disclosed by Koga with "sufficient specificity" to constitute an anticipation of the claims.

2. No Reason for Anticipation or Motivation for Obviousness

Koga provides neither reason for anticipation nor any motivation regarding obviousness. First, Koga never discloses any effect on straight travel stability or recording head discharge stability by adding tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer. As such there is no reason for anticipation of the unexpected results of the current application that the addition of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer, such that the content of tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether is 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to a total amount of the ink, improves the straight travel stability while maintaining the improved recovery performance and fixation performance obtained by the addition of the acrylic polymer.

Second, Koga teaches solving the problem of color bleed by using a polyoxyalkylene glycol-n-alkyl ether. Koga, P. 3, ¶ [0044]. Specifically, Koga teaches that it is the combination of (1) a poly propylene glycol-n-butyl ether having three or more propylene oxides with (2) an acetylene glycol/ethylene oxide adduct and (3) another polyoxyalkylene glycol-n-alkyl ether that alleviates bleeding. Koga, P. 3, ¶ [0045].

Never does Koga discuss any interaction between tripropylene glycol normal butyl ether and an acrylic polymer. In fact, the acrylic polymer in Koga is disclosed as a dispersant rather than for use to improve recovery performance and fixation performance.

Since Koga never discusses any of the problems addressed by the current application and uses the acrylic polymer only as a dispersant, it provides no motivation to solve the problems addressed in the current application. As such, Koga does not render the narrowly claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 5% obvious.

In addition, Claim 4 is dependant upon Claim 1. As Claim 1 is allowable, so must be Claim 4.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 4 is not disclosed with “sufficient specificity” by Koga to constitute anticipation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0073759 to Koga et al.

D. CLAIM 5

Claim 5 is dependant upon Claim 1. As Claim 1 is allowable, so must be Claim 5. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0073759 to Koga et al.

E. CLAIM 6

Claim 6 is dependant upon Claim 1. As Claim 1 is allowable, so must be Claim 6. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0073759 to Koga et al.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7, 8, AND 10-12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) BASED ON KATO

In paragraph 4 of the current Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 7, 8, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kato. This rejection is respectfully traversed and believed overcome in view of the following discussion.

With respect to this rejection, Examiner contends Kato discloses an ink-jet ink comprising water, 0.1-10% self-dispersing carbon black, acrylic resin which is a dispersant for a second colorant present in the ink, and 1-20% solvent such as dipropylene glycol mono-n-propyl ether. 7/13/05 Office Action, P. 4, ¶ 6 (citing Kato, Col. 1, Lns. 9-10; Col. 2, Lns. 33-35 and 40-41; Col. 3, Lns. 55-58; Col. 4, Lns. 43-48; Col. 5, Ln. 3; Col. 7, Lns 42-46; Col. 8, Lns. 2-3 and 6-8; Col. 14, Lns. 3-9).

A. CLAIM 7

Amended Claim 7 states that “a blending ratio of the dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer is 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight.” The reason for this claim language is explained in detail above with regard to Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 7, Examiner contends that, since Kato discloses the glycol ether can be 20% and the acrylic polymer can be 12%, Kato discloses that the ratio of glycol ether to acrylic polymer can be 1.67. 7/13/05 Office Action, P. 4, ¶ 6. Examiner, in effect, argues that while not all inks with the disclosed amounts of glycol ether and acrylic polymer in Kato fall within the claimed ratio range of 0.5-2 of the current application, some combinations do fall within that range. However, Kato never discloses any specific examples falling within the claimed range.

In addition, Kato states that “the weight ratio of the first colorant to the pigment contained in the second colorant in the ink composition is in the range of 1:3 to 7:1....” Kato, Col. 4, Lns. 42-47. Kato also states that the total amount of the first colorant and the pigment contained in the second colorant is not more than 20% by weight based on the ink composition. See, Kato, Col. 4, Lns. 48-52. As a result, Kato discloses that the amount of pigment is not more than 15% ($20/[1+3] \times 3$) by weight based on the ink composition. Kato then goes on to state that the amount of the acrylic resin is in the range of 5 to 150% by weight based on the pigment. See, Kato, Col. 7, Lns. 42-46. As a result, Kato discloses that the amount of acrylic resin is not more than 22.5% (15×1.5) by weight based on the ink composition. Therefore, Kato also discloses that the ratio of the glycol ether with respect to

the acrylic polymer is at least 0.044 (1/22.5) on the basis of weight. As a result, range claimed in the current invention of 0.5 to 2 is much narrower than the range disclosed in Kato.

As with Claim 1 above, the MPEP provides instruction for situations like this. MPEP § 2131.03[II].

1. Unexpected Results

The unexpected result in this case is that, when an acrylic polymer is used in an ink, the requirements for straight travel stability of ink droplets during the discharge, recovery performance upon introduction into the recording head, fixation performance of printed matters, and drying performance after printing can be met by adjusting the blending ratio of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer to be from 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight.

The inventors of the present application discovered, among numerous combinations, that the combination of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether and the acrylic polymer, in the specified proportional range of Claim 7, is excellent in straight travel stability, recovery performance, fixation performance, and drying performance as indicated in Table 12 of the present application.

Before Applicants' discoveries, adding an acrylic polymer to improve the recovery performance upon introduction into the recording head and improve the fixation performance, resulted in unstable discharge from the recording head and deteriorated straight travel stability of ink droplets. Application (as published), P. 1, ¶¶ [0007]-[0008]. It was unexpected that adding dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether, such that the blending ratio of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer is 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight, would stabilize discharge from the recording head and improve straight travel stability while maintaining the improved fixation performance. Because of this unexpected result, Applicants respectfully assert that the narrow claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 2 is not disclosed by Kato with "sufficient specificity" to constitute an anticipation of the claims.

2. No Reason for Anticipation or Motivation for Obviousness

Kato provides neither reason for anticipation nor any motivation regarding obviousness. First, Kato never discloses any effect on straight travel stability or recording head discharge stability by adding dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer. The glycol ethers of Kato are disclosed as being penetrating

agents. Kato, Col. 7, Lns. 47-52. As such there is no reason for anticipation of the unexpected results of the current application that modifying the proportion of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to the acrylic polymer, such that their blending ratio is 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight, improves the straight travel stability while maintaining the improved recovery performance and fixation performance obtained by the addition of the acrylic polymer.

Second, Kato teaches improving color development and fixation by the addition of a first and second colorant to the ink. Kato, Col. 3, Lns. 61-65. Never does Kato discuss any interaction between dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether and an acrylic polymer. In fact, the acrylic polymer in Kato is disclosed as a dispersant for the second colorant, rather than for use to improve recovery performance and fixation performance. Kato, Col. 3., Lns. 66-67; Col. 5, Lns. 1-7 and 45-50.

As a result, Kato provides no motivation to solve the problems addressed in the current application by modifying the proportion of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to the acrylic polymer. As such, Kato does not render the narrowly claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 2 obvious.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 7 is not disclosed with “sufficient specificity” by Kato to constitute anticipation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,440,203 to Kato.

B. CLAIM 8

Claim 8 is dependant upon Claim 7. As Claim 7 is allowable, so must be Claim 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,440,203 to Kato.

C. CLAIM 10

Claim 10 states that “a content of the dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether is 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to a total amount of the ink.”

With respect to this claim, Examiner contends that, since Kato discloses the glycol ether can be in the range of 1-20% it anticipates the claimed range. 7/13/05 Office Action, P. 4, ¶ 6. However, Kato never discloses any specific examples falling within the claimed range. In addition, the range disclosed in Kato both overlaps and is larger than the narrowly claimed range in the current application.

As with Claim 1 above, the MPEP provides instruction for situations like this. MPEP § 2131.03[II].

1. Unexpected Results

The unexpected result in this case is that, when an acrylic polymer is used in an ink, the requirements for straight travel stability of ink droplets during the discharge, recovery performance upon introduction into the recording head, fixation performance of printed matters, and drying performance after printing can be met by the addition of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether in the range of 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to a total amount of the ink.

The inventors of the present application discovered, among numerous combinations, that the combination of the acrylic polymer and dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether, in the specified range of Claim 10, is excellent in straight travel stability, recovery performance, fixation performance, and drying performance as indicated in Table 12 of the present application.

Before Applicants' discoveries, adding an acrylic polymer to improve the recovery performance upon introduction into the recording head and improve the fixation performance, resulted in unstable discharge from the recording head and deteriorated straight travel stability of ink droplets. Application (as published), P. 1, ¶¶ [0007]-[0008]. It was unexpected that adding dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether, such that the content of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether is 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to the total amount of the ink, would stabilize discharge from the recording head and improve straight travel stability while maintaining the improved fixation performance. Because of this unexpected result, Applicants respectfully assert that the narrow claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 5% is not disclosed by Kato with "sufficient specificity" to constitute an anticipation of the claims.

2. No Reason for Anticipation or Motivation for Obviousness

Kato provides neither reason for anticipation nor any motivation regarding obviousness. First, Kato never discloses any effect on straight travel stability or recording head discharge stability by adding dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer. The glycol ethers of Kato are disclosed as being penetrating agents. Kato, Col. 7, Lns. 47-52. As such there is no reason for anticipation of the unexpected results of the current application that the addition of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer, such that the content of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether is 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to a total amount of the ink, improves the

straight travel stability while maintaining the improved recovery performance and fixation performance obtained by the addition of the acrylic polymer.

Second, Kato teaches improving color development and fixation by the addition of a first and second colorant to the ink. Kato, Col. 3, Lns. 61-65. Never does Kato discuss any interaction between dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether and an acrylic polymer. In fact, the acrylic polymer in Kato is disclosed as a dispersant for the second colorant, rather than for use to improve recovery performance and fixation performance. Kato, Col. 3., Lns. 66-67; Col. 5, Lns. 1-7 and 45-50.

As a result, Kato provides no motivation to solve the problems addressed in the current application by modifying the proportion of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to the acrylic polymer. As such, Kato does not render the narrowly claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 5% obvious.

In addition, Claim 10 is dependant upon Claim 7. As Claim 7 is allowable, so must be Claim 10.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 10 is not disclosed with “sufficient specificity” by Kato to constitute anticipation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,440,203 to Kato.

D. CLAIM 11

Claim 11 is dependant upon Claim 7. As Claim 7 is allowable, so must be Claim 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,440,203 to Kato.

E. CLAIM 12

Claim 12 is dependant upon Claim 7. As Claim 7 is allowable, so must be Claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,440,203 to Kato.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7 AND 10-12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(E) BASED ON SEGAWA

In paragraph 5 of the current Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 7 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Segawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed and believed overcome in view of the following discussion.

With respect to this rejection, Examiner contends Segawa discloses an ink-jet ink comprising water, 0.1-20% pigment, 1-20% glycol ether such as dipropylene glycol mono-n-propyl ether, and an acrylic polymer dispersant. 7/13/05 Office Action, P. 4-5, ¶ 7 (citing Segawa, paragraphs 18, 27, 33, 36 [lines 3-4], 65 [lines 17-18], and 79).

A. CLAIM 7

Amended Claim 7 states that “a blending ratio of the dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer is 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight.” The reason for this claim language is explained in detail above with regard to Claim 1.

With respect to this claim, Examiner contends that, since Segawa discloses the glycol ether can be 1-20% and the acrylic polymer can be 0.63%, Segawa discloses that the ratio of glycol ether to acrylic polymer is approximately 1.6 to 33. 7/13/05 Office Action, P. 4-5, ¶ 7. Examiner, in effect, argues that while not all inks with the disclosed amounts of glycol ether and acrylic polymer in Kato fall within the claimed ratio range of 0.5-2 of the current application, some combinations do fall within that range. However, Kato never discloses any specific examples falling within the claimed range.

In addition, Segawa does not disclose any range for the permitted amount of acrylic polymer. See, Segawa, p. 3, ¶¶ [0034]-[0037]. The value the examiner cites of 0.63% comes from a couple examples in Segawa. Segawa, P. 7, Example 1; P. 8, Example 7. This is not a disclosure of an acceptable range for the acrylic polymer, but is rather an example of an acceptable value of the acrylic polymer. As such, Segawa sets no limits on the amount of acrylic polymer that can be added to the ink. Therefore, Segawa similarly discloses no blending ration range of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether with respect to the acrylic polymer. As a result, range claimed in the current invention of 0.5 to 2 is much narrower than the range disclosed in Segawa, since Segawa discloses no range at all.

As with Claim 1 above, the MPEP provides instruction for situations like this. MPEP § 2131.03[II].

1. Unexpected Results

The unexpected result in this case is stated above in the discussion relating to Kato and Claim 7. Because of this unexpected result, Applicants respectfully assert that the narrow claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 2 is not disclosed by Segawa with “sufficient specificity” to constitute an anticipation of the claims.

2. No Reason for Anticipation or Motivation for Obviousness

Segawa provides neither reason for anticipation nor any motivation regarding obviousness. First, Segawa never discloses any effect on straight travel stability or recording head discharge stability by adding dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer. The glycol ethers of Segawa are disclosed as being penetrating agents. Segawa, P. 5, ¶ [0064]. As such there is no reason for anticipation of the unexpected results of the current application that modifying the proportion of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to the acrylic polymer, such that their blending ratio is 0.5 to 2 on the basis of weight, improves the straight travel stability while maintaining the improved recovery performance and fixation performance obtained by the addition of the acrylic polymer.

Second, Segawa never discusses any interaction between dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether and an acrylic polymer. In fact, the acrylic polymer in Segawa is disclosed as a dispersant for the pigment, rather than for use to improve recovery performance and fixation performance. Segawa, P. 3, ¶ [0034] and [0036].

As a result, Segawa provides no motivation to solve the problems addressed in the current application by modifying the proportion of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to the acrylic polymer. As such, Segawa does not render the narrowly claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 2 obvious.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 7 is not disclosed with “sufficient specificity” by Segawa to constitute anticipation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0024086 to Segawa et al.

B. CLAIM 10

Claim 10 states that “a content of the dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether is 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to a total amount of the ink.”

With respect to this claim, Examiner contends that, since Kato discloses the glycol ether can be in the range of 1-20% it anticipates the claimed range. 7/13/05 Office

Action, P. 4-7, ¶ 7. However, Kato never discloses any specific examples falling within the claimed range. In addition, the range disclosed in Kato both overlaps and is larger than the narrowly claimed range in the current application.

As with Claim 1 above, the MPEP provides instruction for situations like this. MPEP § 2131.03[II].

1. Unexpected Results

The unexpected result in this case is stated above in the discussion relating to Kato and Claim 10. Because of this unexpected result, Applicants respectfully assert that the narrow claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 5% is not disclosed by Segawa with “sufficient specificity” to constitute an anticipation of the claims.

2. No Reason for Anticipation or Motivation for Obviousness

Segawa provides neither reason for anticipation nor any motivation regarding obviousness. First, Segawa never discloses any effect on straight travel stability or recording head discharge stability by adding dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer. The glycol ethers of Segawa are disclosed as being penetrating agents. Segawa, P. 5, ¶ [0064]. As such there is no reason for anticipation of the unexpected results of the current application that the addition of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to an ink containing an acrylic polymer, such that the content of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether is 0.5 to 5% by weight with respect to a total amount of the ink, improves the straight travel stability while maintaining the improved recovery performance and fixation performance obtained by the addition of the acrylic polymer.

Second, Segawa never discusses any interaction between dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether and an acrylic polymer. In fact, the acrylic polymer in Segawa is disclosed as a dispersant for the pigment, rather than for use to improve recovery performance and fixation performance. Segawa, P. 3, ¶ [0034] and [0036].

As a result, Segawa provides no motivation to solve the problems addressed in the current application by modifying the proportion of dipropylene glycol normal propyl ether to the acrylic polymer. As such, Segawa does not render the narrowly claimed ratio range of 0.5 to 2 obvious.

In addition, Claim 10 is dependant upon Claim 7. As Claim 7 is allowable, so must be Claim 10.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 10 is not disclosed with “sufficient specificity” by Segawa to constitute anticipation. Therefore, Applicants

respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0024086 to Segawa et al.

C. CLAIM 11

Claim 11 is dependant upon Claim 7. As Claim 7 is allowable, so must be Claim 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0024086 to Segawa et al.

D. CLAIM 12

Claim 12 is dependant upon Claim 7. As Claim 7 is allowable, so must be Claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner remove the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0024086 to Segawa et al.

V. REJECTION OF 7-12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(E) BASED ON VALENTINI

In paragraph 6 of the current Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Valentini. This rejection is respectfully traversed and believed overcome in view of the following discussion.

Valentini was filed on May 11, 2004, and claimed no priority from any other application. As such, Valentini's 102(e) date is May 11, 2004. The current application was filed on September 23, 2003. As a result, the 102(e) date for the current application predates that of Valentini. Thus, Valentini cannot be a proper 102(e) reference against the current application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner's rejection of claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0020730 to Valentini et al is improper.

Serial No.: 10/668,574
Atty. Docket No.: 501152.20022

Based upon the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact him at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene LeDonne Reg. No. 50,900
Eugene LeDonne – Reg. No. 35,930
REEDSMITH LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Tel.: 212.521.5400

ELD:BS:JWT

501152.20022